Sulfolane Toxicity Meeting

Tuesday, August 2, 2011, 10:30 am Alaska time

Attendees

Selene Chou, ATSDR Division of Toxicology and Environmental Medicine, Chair ATSDR MRL Workgroup

Jim Durant, ATSDR Emergency Response Coordinator with DTEM

Brandon Perkins, EPA Region 10, Site Assessment Manager

Dan Petersen, EPA NCEA-ORD, Chemical Manager for the Sulfolane PPRTV

Scott Masten, Toxicologist, manages nomination program NIEHS, NIH

Ann Farris, Alaska Dept. of Environmental Conservation (DEC), Contaminated Sites Project Manager

Stephanie Pingree Buss, SPB Consulting – consultant for Alaska DEC

Nim Ha, Alaska DHSS

Denise Elston, Alaska DEC

Meeting Summary

1) Introductions
   a) New participant Dr. Masten with NIH
2) EPA Status of PPRTV (Petersen)
   a) PPRTV document has completed external review
      i) New, previously not included journal article incorporated
         (1) Rat study for distribution of sulfolane, pharmacokinetic study
         (2) Does not impact numerical PPRTV values
      ii) Principal study (HLS study) – not peer-reviewed
         (1) HLS study is still undergoing peer-review
         (2) Peer review should complete by September 10th
   b) Still estimating September 30th completion of PPRTV document
   c) At this time, does not expect PPRTV values in draft document to change
   d) EPA was contacted by State of Alaska, Rep. Wilson staff
      i) Wanted a copy of the draft PPRTV document which was sent out (External Review Draft)
3) NIH Process and Review of Sulfolane Material (Masten)
   a) NTP nomination is an open process and anything can be nominated
   b) Most often NTP receives requests from state and federal agencies
   c) Would like formal request
      i) Could be letter from agency, doesn't have to be head of agency

ii) Request should explain problem, reason, rationale, why data is needed, what kind of studies envisioned, understanding of how data will be used
iii) NTP would develop supporting document
(1) Already been done by ATSDR and EPA
iv) NTP Review Process
(1) Interagency review
(2) Public Review
(3) SAB Review
(4) Public comment after SAB Review
v) Can take 6-9 months to move through review process
(1) Upcoming meetings are being scheduled
vi) If nominated, NTP would put together research plan
(1) Type of studies identified
vii) Expect sulfolane would get favorable review
(1) Potential issue – responsible party (RP) involvement
(2) DEC not currently asking RP to do additional research
(a) They are blocking human exposure with treatment systems
viii) Obvious data gaps
(1) Clearly needs to be more work done
(2) In utero and early life exposure
(3) Reproductive toxicology studies
(4) Neurological toxicology studies
(5) NTP has protocol for a single study that could look at all those endpoints
(6) Don't see need for 2 year carcinogenicity study
(a) Based on results on sulfolene study

d) Next steps
i) Send a formal request from ADEC, ATSDR or both
ii) Requests go to Dr. Masten
(1) Example on website
(2) Dr. Masten to send examples of request to group
iii) Could finish review by end of the year (possibly)
iv) Study could take years (7 years for carcinogenic study)
v) ADEC to write request
(1) Joint signature with ATSDR, DHSS
(a) Nim and Jim to look into joint signature or letter of support

4) Comments from ATSDR (if any; Durant)
a) No additional information
5) Additional Discussion
a) Mid-September touch base